



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,563	01/30/2002	Leendert J. van der Windt	304249	7647

28264 7590 03/12/2003

MICHAEL P. WILLIAMS  
BOND, SCHOENECK & KING, PLLC  
ONE LINCOLN CENTER  
SYRACUSE, NY 13202

EXAMINER

CRUZ, LOURDES C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/060,563

Applicant(s)

VAN DER WINDT, LEENDERT J.

Examiner

Lourdes C. Cruz

Art Unit

2827

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \*   c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's election without traverse of Claims 22-42 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

#### ***Drawings***

All Figures are improperly crosshatched. All of the cross hatching patterns should be selected from those shown on page 600-81 of the MPEP based on the material of the part. Also see 35 CFR 184 (h)(3) and MPEP 608.02.

#### ***Specification***

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 22-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. For example, **claim 22** cites on line 3+ of the claim "formed through holes by material removed from **the**

**first side... of the backing... the top...**" which, in formal terms, lacks antecedent basis. However, the limitation is also not clear when read in conjunction with the remainder of the claim. As a further example, on lines 5+ the limitation "removed said plating from..." does not make clear what structure is being claimed. What is the final structure? If Applicant intends to claim an apparatus (see preamble), why is the method of making such steps recited? Regarding **claims 24 and 26**, the limitation "plurality of conductive materials" is unclear since the examiner cannot ascertain whether multiple layers or an alloy is being claimed. **Claim 42** recites "a plurality of resins" which renders the claim unclear for the same reason claim 26 does. And specifically regarding **claim 32**, the language "is a plurality of shapes" does not sufficiently define what is being recited or where the "plurality of shapes" is to be located in the through hole in juxtaposition, as that appears to be the claimed feature. **Claim 28** recites "said resins" which lacks antecedent basis. **Claim 33** recites "full metal and partial metal"; the examiner cannot ascertain if this (partial) refers to partial layering or to a mixture of materials; additionally what "full metal" refers to is not clear either. **Claim 35** recites a statement b), which in its whole lacks antecedent basis for all its structural limitations do.

In summary, the application contains claims so unclear with limitations which cannot be distinguished between apparatus limitations or "product by process" ones, and moreover, with indefiniteness and lack of antecedent basis so prevalent though out the claims, that the scope of the claims and the invention was difficult to ascertain.

Art Unit: 2827

**Claims 22-42** have not been rejected over the prior art because, in light of the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections supra, there is a great deal of confusion and uncertainty as to the proper interpretation of the limitations of the claims; hence, it would not be proper to reject the claims on the basis of prior art. As stated in *In re Steele*, 305 F.2d 859, 134 USPQ 292 (CCPA 1962), a rejection should not be based on considerable speculation about the meaning of terms employed in a claim or assumptions that must be made as to the scope of the claims. See also MPEP 2173.06.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lourdes C. Cruz whose telephone number is 703-306-5691. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Lourdes Cruz  
March 9, 2003

Lourdes C. Cruz  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2827



DAVID L. TALBOTT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800